REMARKS

With entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-18 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 10-12, and 15-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Russell-Falla et al. (U.S. Patent 6,675,162) . Claims 8, 9, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla et al. Claims 4, 5, 13, and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla et al. in view of Haug et al. (U.S. Patent 6,556,964). The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The present invention relates to a computer method and apparatus that determines the content type of a subject Web page. In one embodiment, a predefined set of potential content types is first provided. Then, a <u>distinguishing series of tests</u> is prepared for each content type to be identified (See Application page 9, lines 7-11 and page 14, lines 13-24). For each potential content type, the distinguishing series of tests, when applied, have test results that enable a quantitative evaluation of the contents of the subject Web page. The <u>distinguishing series of tests</u> may include, but not be limited to: <u>1) determining whether a predefined piece of data or keyword that appears in the subject Web page, 2) examining syntax or grammar text properties, 3) examining page format and style, 4) examining links in the subject Web page, and 5) examining links that refer to the subject Web page</u> (See Claims 6, 16 and 17).

Based on the test results, a respective probability for each potential content type being detected in some contents of the subject Web page may be determined. A Bayesian network is preferably used and combines the test results to provide indications of the types of contents detected on the subject Web page. Then, a confidence level per detected content type may be provided. In one embodiment, a database stores the determined probabilities and confidence levels, and thus, provides a cross reference between Web pages and respective content types of contents found on the Web pages.

The Russell-Falla et al. patent describes computer-implemented methods for characterizing a specific category of information content within certain types of media such as "web pages, e-mail, and other types of digital datasets" (col. 1, lines 15-16). With regard to Web pages, the characterization occurs by examining the content of a particular Web page and

determining whether to display the Web page contents to the user. The examining step "includes identifying and <u>analyzing the web page natural language content relative to a predetermined database of words</u> - or more broadly regular expressions - to form a rating" (col. 2, lines 55-59).

In other words, Russell-Falla et al. performs <u>one type of test only</u> in which <u>certain words or phrases within a subject Web page are compared with a list of words or phrases associated with a particular category of information content</u>. Russell-Falla et al. then determines "a total number of natural language words that appear in the identified natural language textual portions of the web page" to establish a "weighting" for the word or phrase associated with the likelihood that the web page satisfies a particular category of page, such as a "pornographic page" (col. 3, lines 24-57).

The Haug et al. patent describes a natural language understanding system that uses a Bayesian network to determine the most probable concept or meaning associated with a sentence or phrase derived from a patient medical record. The Bayesian network is only applied to the grammatic, syntactic, and semantic relationship of words in a sentence or phrase (col. 4, lines 21-23).

According to the Examiner, base Claims 1 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Russell-Falla et al. because Russell-Falla et al. "teach a method and apparatus for determining [the] content type of a web page" with all of the elements of base Claims 1 and 10 (See Office Action page 3, Section 6). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In particular, the Examiner stated in Section 6 that the element "running test enabling quantitative evaluation of some contents of the selected web page being of the potential content type (column 2, lines 55-64) " is taught in Russell-Falla et al. Russell-Falla et al., however, only describes <u>one type of test</u> in which <u>certain words or phrases within a subject Web page are compared with a list of words or phrases associated with a particular category of information content</u>. In contrast, the present invention, as recited in base Claims 1 and 10 as now amended, uses a "<u>distinguishing series of tests</u>" to evaluate the contents of a subject Web page (See Application page 9, line 7 and page 14, line 13).

In fact, the one type of test taught by Russell-Falla et al. appears to <u>only</u> correspond to the test "determining whether a predefined piece of data or keyword that appears in the subject Web page" that is one of a series of exemplary tests recited in Claims 6, 16, and 17 of the present

Application. Russell-Falla et al. neither teaches nor suggests any of the other exemplary tests that may be part of a more expansive distinguishing series of tests.

Therefore, because Russell-Falla et al. does not teach all of the elements within amended base Claims 1 and 10, the Applicant respectfully submits that the § 102 rejection regarding independent Claims 1 and 10 should be withdrawn.

Because Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 11, 12, and 15-17 depend from and are limited by base Claims 1 and 10 respectively, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

Furthermore, because there is no suggestion or motivation within Russell-Falla et al. to use a distinguishing series of tests to evaluate the content of a subject Web page, the Office Action fails to make a case of prima facie obviousness regarding now amended base Claims 1 and 10. Claims 8, 9, and 18 depend from and are limited by base Claims 1 and 10 respectively, which are argued above to be in an allowable condition. Accordingly, the § 103 rejection of Claims 8, 9, and 18 based on Russell-Falla et al. should be withdrawn.

With regard to Claims 4, 5, 13, and 14 being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russell-Falla et al. in view of Haug et al., Haug et al. does not add the use of a distinguishing series of tests which is lacking from Russell-Falla et al. Because the combination of Russell-Falla et al. and Haug et al. does not make a case of prima facie obviousness regarding the invention as now claimed in base Claims 1 and 10, the § 103 rejection of Claims 4 and 5, which are dependent from and limited by base Claim 1, should be withdrawn. Also, the § 103 rejection of dependent Claims 13 and 14, which are dependent from and limited by base Claim 10, should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By _____
Mary Lou Wakimura
Registration No. 31,804
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Dated: